



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,493	03/23/2004	Ching-Hui Yen	10113961	2782
34283	7590	03/15/2006		
QUINTERO LAW OFFICE 1617 BROADWAY, 3RD FLOOR SANTA MONICA, CA 90404			EXAMINER WUJCIAK, ALFRED J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3632	
DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/806,493

Applicant(s)

YEN ET AL.

Examiner

Alfred Joseph Wujciak III

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 25 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 12-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-11 and 17-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is the final Office Action for the serial number 10/806,493, Liquid Crystal Display, filed on 3/23/04.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent # 5,501,420 to Watt et al. and in view of US Patent # 5,870,280 to Cho.

Watt et al. teaches a display (figure 2 a) comprising a supporting base having a first section (58), a second section (26a), a third section (24 and 40), a first pivot (pin on 26c) position between the first section and the second section, and a second pivot (28 with pin) positioned between the second section and the third section. The display includes a display unit (20) connected to the third section of the supporting base, exerting a first torque on the first pivot by a weight of the display unit. The display includes a pre-force mechanism (26d) connected to the first pivot exerting a second torque on the first pivot and the second torque and the first torque being in opposite directions. The second section of the supporting base is hollow and the pre-force mechanism is disposed in the second section. The first pivot comprises a fixed element (26c) connected to the first section of the supporting base and a movable element (26b)

Art Unit: 3632

connected to the second section of the supporting base. The pre-force mechanism having a first end connected to the first pivot and a second end movably disposed in the second section.

Watt et al. teaches the display but fails to teach the display is a liquid crystal display. Cho teaches the liquid crystal display (40). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced Watt et al.'s display with liquid crystal display as taught by Cho to provide better picture from the display.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-11 and 17-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 25 is allowed.

The prior art fails to teach a spring disposed on the rod and pressed against the stopper.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/5/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching,

Art Unit: 3632

suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Watts et al. and Cho teach stand for supporting monitor/television and that they teach analogous art for supporting monitor/television using stand. The examiner is allowed to make combination rejection using Cho's LCD to replace with Watts et al.'s CRT television to upgrade technology for the viewer.

The applicant believes that Watt et al.'s two ends of the spring (26d) are fixed. The examiner disagrees with the applicant because, if the both ends of spring were fixed, the second section would not be allowed to move in horizontal direction. It would be stuck in one position because the fixed ends of spring would prevent the second section from moving. Figures 2a and 2b from Watt et al.'s invention show that the spring (26d) changes its position in the second section in order to allow the second section to move in horizontal direction. Therefore the second end of the spring is movably disposed in the second section.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 3632

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Joseph Wujciak III whose telephone number is (571) 272-6827. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am-4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on (571) 272-6815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Alfred Joseph Wujciak III
Examiner
Art Unit 3632 *ATV*

3/8/06

 3/9/06
ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600